

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**

Handwritten mark



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/594,507	06/15/2000	Sara Elo	SOM9-2000-0002/1963-7384	9346

7590 07/01/2004

WILLIAM E. LEWIS
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY,, NY 11560

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Handwritten signature

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/594,507

Applicant(s)

ELO ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment and response filed 4/8/04 to the application filed on 6/15/00.
2. Claims 15-17 are added.
3. Claims 1-17 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 12, 15 are independent claims.
4. The objection of the specification as including information inconsistent with the drawings has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
5. The objections of claims 13-14 as including a typographical error have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
6. The rejections of claims 1, 6-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weingarden in view of Bernardo and Pacifici have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' argument.
7. The rejections of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weingarden in view of Bernardo and Pacifici, and further in view of Boag have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weingarden et al. (US Pat No. 6,164,975, 12/26/00, filed 12/11/98) in view of Alexander (US Pat No. 6,732,331 B1, 5/4/04, filed 2/15/00).

Regarding independent claim 8, Weingarden discloses:

- creating a user profile indicative of an optimum mode of learning (col 7, lines 10-41, 53-67: *a cognitive profile of a user is built* based on the various learner records by the Learning System where the learner records are the summary of the user's preference optimized by the system; col 7, lines 23-41: a user profile created from the information gathered from the learners, actually the users, based on the learner responses to the questions made by the learning system)

Art Unit: 2178

- providing a web page to a user that matches the user's optimum mode of learning based upon an identifier of the user's profile (col 7, lines 41-52: providing to a user the version of a web page that best matches the cognitive style of each user based on the cognitive profile)

Weindgarden does not disclose:

- creating document templates using a syntax
- creating content in a language
- creating style sheets in a format mapped to the content to the different modes of learning
- combining the content file with the style sheets to generate a web file

Alexander discloses:

- creating document templates using a syntax (col 6, lines 24-56: the XML template and the stored Web template indicate that the document template is created using a syntax)
- creating content in a language (col 5, line 66 to col 6, line 15: the element builder creates the content for the web page in HTML or XML)
- creating style sheets in a format mapped to the content to the different modes of learning (figure 4, col 6, lines 38-55: the *stored style sheets* 58 with the web templates indicates that the *style sheets are created* for generating a web page; based on a user request for a web page which includes the user's preference of the web page, the style sheets should be selected to map to the content that

meet the user's request where *meeting a user's request by the system* is one of the modes of learning)

- combining the content file with the style sheets to generate a web file (col 6, lines 23-56: the content data in the XML template and XML document and the stored style sheets are combined to generate a web page)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Alexander and Weingarden for the following reason.

Alexander provides the template, the content, and the style sheets for generating a web page *based on the user request* providing the advantage to apply into Weingarden for generating a web page to provide to a user that matches the user's optimum mode of learning based upon an identifier of the user's profile since the request in Alexander must include the user's preferences of the web page which is known as a part of the user's profile and learned by the system to provide a generated web page that meets the request.

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Weingarden discloses calculating a user's profile based upon responses to a questionnaire and a cognitive learning theory (col 7, lines 23-41 and col 10, line 25 to col 11, line 47: computing vector of weights for a user profile created from the information gathered from the learners, actually the users, based on the learner responses to the questions made by the learning system).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 10, which is dependent on claim 8, Weingarden discloses calculating a user profile as a vector of weights (col 10, line 25 to col 11, line 47: computing the vector of weights for a profile based on a user's cognitive preferences).

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent on claim 8, Weingarden discloses providing a user information defined by the style sheets and user profile in an HTML file based upon a HTTP cookie or URL string with an encoded profile identifier or user name (col 7, lines 41-52: using a cookie stored in a user computer to determine the version of the web page that best matches the cognitive style of the user where the cognitive style in the user profile controls the version of a HTML document).

Claims 1, 6-7 are for a system of method claims 8-11, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 12-14 are for an article of manufacture of method claims 8-11, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claims 2-5, which are dependent on claim 1, Weingarden discloses that the HTML files are created for content and correspond to the different modes of learning (col 7, lines 41-52: the versions of a HTML document are created and controlled by the cognitive styles in the user profile which corresponds to the different modes of learning).

Weingarden does not disclose that the document template are created with the Document Type Definition (DTD) syntax, the style sheets are created using an Extensible Style Sheet Language (XSL), and the content is created using Extensible Mark-Up Language (XML).

Alexander discloses that the style sheets are created using an Extensible Style Sheet Language (XSL), and the content is created using Extensible Mark-Up Language (XML) (col 6, lines 38-56, col 11, lines 48-58). The storing of the XML template in the system (figure 4 and col 6, lines 38-56) implies that the template are created with the DTD syntax since the template codes should include the elements for a document as well as the tags used to recognize them based on the DTD syntax of HTML or XML.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Alexander into Weingarden to expand the employment of HTML and CSS to XML and XSL since in Alexander, a markup language can be used in XML and XSL which are the extensible markup form of HTML and CSS.

Regarding independent claim 15, Weingarden discloses:

- storing one or more user profile on a disk, wherein each user profile comprises an optimum mode of learning (col 7, lines 23-52: the cognitive profile of a user is stored locally as a cookie placed on the user computer, where a cookie is known as stored on a disk of the computer)
- displaying a web page to a user based on the one or more web files and the optimum mode of learning in the user's profile (col 7, lines 41-52: providing to a

user the version of a web page that best matches the cognitive style of each user based on the cognitive profile where providing a web page to a user means displaying a web page to a user)

Weingarden does not disclose creating a document template and generating one or more web files according to one or more modes of learning and the document template.

Alexander discloses:

- creating a document template (col 6, lines 24-56: the fact that the XML template and the stored Web template indicates that the document template is created)
- generating one or more web files according to one or more modes of learning and the document template (figure 4, col 6, lines 38-55: generating a web page based on the stored template and style sheets upon the request from a user where the request implies the user's preference for the requested web page, thus *generating a web page that meets a user's request* is one of the modes of learning by the system)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Alexander into Weingarden since Alexander discloses creating a web page using web page templates upon a request from a user, where such a request implies a user's preference for the web page providing the advantage to apply that feature to the user profile in Weingarden for generating a web page based on both the template of Alexander and the modes of learning included in the profile of Weingarden.

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent on claim 15, Weingarden does not disclose creating of one or more style sheets and input content for the web page.

Alexander discloses creating of one or more style sheets and input content for the web page (figure 4, col 6, lines 1-56: the style sheets and the content for web pages are created and stored in the system).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Alexander into Weingarden since Alexander provides the style sheets and templates for generating a web page upon a user request thus motivating to incorporate Alexander into Weingarden for generating a web page personalized for each user based on both the template and the modes of learning contained in the user profile.

Regarding claim 17, which is dependent on claim 16, Weingarden does not disclose that generating one or more web files using the one or more style sheets and the input content.

Alexander discloses generating one or more web files using the one or more style sheets and the input content (figure 4, col 6, lines 1-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Alexander into Weingarden since Alexander provides the style sheets and the content for generating a web page upon a user request thus motivating to incorporate into Weingarden for generating a web page personalized for

Art Unit: 2178

each user based on the style sheets and the content appropriate for a requested web page.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicants argue that Bernardo, Pacifici, and Boag can not be used as 103 (a) references since these references are precluded under 35 U.S.C. 103 (c).

Examiner agrees.

Alexander, cited in the office action, is replaced for Bernardo, Pacifici, and Boag for disclosing the claimed features of the invention taught by Bernardo, Pacifici, and Boag.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ferris et al. (US Pat No. 5,937,418, 8/10/99, filed 7/1/97).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Cong-Lac Huynh
Examiner
Art Unit 2178
6/25/04